

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,999	04/03/2001	Kung Chen	P/3491-41	3857
2352	7590	06/04/2004	EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/824,999

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua D Campbell

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 04/03/2001.
2. Claims 1-6 are pending in this case. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Drawings

3. The drawings were received on 4/3/2001. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The use of terms contained in quotes does not clearly define the scope of that claim. Appropriate correction is required. Also, as claim 6 is currently written, ("...where in the plurality of control items comprises *a respective control item of...*") it is only necessary for one item of that list to be present for a prior art reference to properly read on the claimed limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1- 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz (US Patent Number 6,587,125, filed on August 1, 2000).

Regarding independent claim 1, Paroz teaches a method in which a toolbar (interface) have a plurality of control items for a user to select and edit are translated into a intermediate representation (column 7-9 of Paroz). The interface is then converted into a DHTML interface representation based on rules that is logically equivalent in all control items, both in event handling and statement (column 7-9 of Paroz). Paroz does not disclose that a logical mapping table determines the logical equivalence or that the conversion is based on a representation-mapping table. However, Paroz does disclose that the logic necessary for equivalence is determined and that the rules necessary for conversion are also determined (column 7-9 of Paroz). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined the method of Paroz with the use of mapping tables because it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to use tables in order to better organize data to be used by a program.

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3, Paroz teaches a method in which the conversion can be performed on Microsoft Windows GUI environments and other common interface environments (column 7, lines 31-46 of Paroz). Paroz does directly teach that the conversion method could be performed on Visual Basic and Delphi interfaces. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method of Paroz with VB and Delphi interfaces because the interfaces were well known in the art at the time the invention was made and it would have increased the portability to operate on these two well known interfaces.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Paroz teaches a method in which the intermediate representation exists as XML data (column 10, lines 35-57 of Paroz).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Paroz teaches a method in which control items in a GUI are converted which includes items such as labels, text boxes, command buttons, and other GUI function items (Figure 3 of Paroz).

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz (US Patent Number 6,587,125, filed on August 1, 2000) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rempell (US Patent Number 6,546,397, filed on December 2, 1999).

Regarding independent claim 5, Paroz does not disclose the use of CSS with the DHTML interfaces. However, Rempell discloses a method in which interfaces are built using a combination of CSS and DHTML (column 21, lines 31-67 of Rempell). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Paroz and Rempell because it would have allowed for new interfaces to be identical visually and behaviorally to their originals.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent Number 5,831,609

US Patent Number 6,434,628


US Patent Number 6,714,219

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (703)305-5764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703)308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC
May 27, 2004


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER